

1
2
3
4
5 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
6 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

7 RANDHIR K. SINGH,

8 Petitioner,

No. CIV S-04-2120 DFL JFM P

9 vs.

10 A.P. KANE, Warden, et al.,

11 Respondents.

ORDER

12 _____ /

13 Petitioner has requested the appointment of counsel. There currently exists no
14 absolute right to appointment of counsel in habeas proceedings. See Nevius v. Sumner, 105 F.3d
15 453, 460 (9th Cir. 1996). However, 18 U.S.C. § 3006A authorizes the appointment of counsel at
16 any stage of the case “if the interests of justice so require.” See Rule 8(c), Fed. R. Governing
17 § 2254 Cases. In the present case, the court does not find that the interests of justice would be
18 served by the appointment of counsel at the present time.

19 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that petitioner’s November 17, 2006
20 request for appointment of counsel is denied without prejudice to a renewal of the motion at a
21 later stage of the proceedings.

22 DATED: December 12, 2006.

23 
24 John F. Marshall
25 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE